

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Angela Ethridge Sturm,) Civil Action No.: 6:13-1097-MGL
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) **OPINION AND ORDER**
)
Carolyn W. Colvin,¹)
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,)
)
 Defendant.)
)
_____)

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. Plaintiff Angela Ethridge Sturm (“Plaintiff”), brought this action seeking judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying Plaintiff’s claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act. (ECF No. 1.)

On July 7, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation finding that the Commissioner’s decision is based on substantial evidence and free of legal error. (ECF No. 40.) Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed. (ECF No. 40 at 33.) Neither party filed objections to the Report and Recommendation and the time for doing so expired on July 24, 2014.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The

¹Carolyn W. Colvin became the Acting Commissioner of Social Security on February 14, 2013. Pursuant to Rule 25(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Carolyn W. Colvin should be substituted for Michael J. Astrue as Defendant in this lawsuit.

recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to him with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

The Court has carefully reviewed the record and concurs in the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. The Court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. The decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge

July 30, 2014
Spartanburg, South Carolina

